

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-14. In a previous response, Claims 6-7 and 10-13 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claim 14 was withdrawn. In the present response, no claims have been amended, added, or canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-5 and 8-9 are currently pending in the application.

#### **I. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,624 to Xu, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,630 to Frankel, U.S. Patent No. 6,146,504 to Patadia, *et al.*, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0029895 by Hanamachi, *et al.* The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited combination, as applied by the Examiner, fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 1. For instance, the cited combination fails to teach or suggest a removable, detachable pedestal slip cover overlying a planar upper surface of a chuck and extending laterally beyond the sidewalls of the chuck as recited in independent Claim 1.

The Examiner recognizes that Xu fails to teach a pedestal cover extending laterally beyond the sidewalls and asserts that Frankel cures this deficiency. (*See Examiner's Action electronically delivered July 12, 2007, page 3.*) Frankel teaches a pedestal 12 coated with a protective layer 500 preferably covers the entire upper surface 501 and side peripheral surface 12d of the pedestal 12. (*See, for example, column 11, lines 1-5 and Figure 8A.*) Thus, Frankel teaches a coating covers both an upper surface and side surfaces of a pedestal. The Applicants fail to find where Frankel teaches or

suggests a removable, detachable pedestal cover extending laterally beyond sidewalls of a chuck as recited in independent Claim 1. As such, Frankel, as applied by the Examiner, fails to cure the deficiency of Xu. Additionally, Hanamachi does not teach or suggest a removable, detachable pedestal slip cover extending laterally beyond sidewalls of a chuck. Therefore, the cited combination fails to teach or suggest every element of independent Claim 1 and, thus, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claim 1 or Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and allow issuance thereof.

## **II. Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi and in further view of Applicants' admitted prior art. As established above, the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claim 1. The Examiner has not cited Applicants' admitted prior art to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claim 3. (See Examiner's Action electronically delivered July 12, 2007, page 6.) Additionally, the Applicants do not find where Applicants' admitted prior art cures the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination. As such, the above cited combination and Applicants' admitted prior art, as applied by the Examiner, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 3 and allow issuance thereof.

### **III. Rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,656,093 to Burkhardt, *et al.* As established above, the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claim 1. The Examiner has not cited Burkhardt to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claim 8. (*See* Examiner's Action electronically delivered July 12, 2007, page 7.) Additionally, the Applicants do not find where Burkhardt cures the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination. As such, the above cited combination and Burkhardt, as applied by the Examiner, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 8 and allow issuance thereof.

#### IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-5 and 8-9.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC



Charles W. Gaines  
Registration No. 36,804

Dated: 10/8/07

P.O. Box 832570  
Richardson, Texas 75083  
(972) 480-8800